arXiv:1611.09993v1 [math.DG] 30 Nov 2016

The exponential map of the group of area-preserving diffeomorphisms of a surface with boundary

James Benn, Gerard Misiołek and Stephen C. Preston

December 1, 2016

Abstract

We prove that the Riemannian exponential map of the right-invariant L^2 metric on the group of volume-preserving diffeomorphisms of a two-dimensional manifold with a nonempty boundary is a nonlinear Fredholm map of index zero.

1 Introduction

Consider a compact n-dimensional manifold M with a smooth boundary ∂M equipped with a Riemannian metric. Let $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ be the volumorphism group; that is, the group of diffeomorphisms of M which preserve the Riemannian volume form μ and are of Sobolev class H^s. It is well-known that if $s > n/2 + 1$, then $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ is a submanifold of the infinite dimensional Hilbert manifold $\mathscr{D}^s$ of all H^s diffeomorphisms of M. Its tangent space $T_\eta\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ consists of H^s sections X of the pull-back bundle η^*TM whose right-translations $X\circ\eta^{-1}$ to the identity element are the divergence-free vector fields on M that are parallel to the boundary ∂M. The L^2 inner product for vector fields

$$\langle u, v\rangle_{L^2} = \int_M \langle u(x), v(x)\rangle \, d\mu(x) \qquad u, v \in T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu \tag{1.1}$$

defines a right-invariant metric on $\mathscr{D}^s$ and hence also on $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ with associated Levi-Civita connections. The curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}$ of this metric on $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ is a bounded trilinear operator on each tangent space and is invariant with respect to right translations by $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$. Our main references for the basic facts about $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ and its L^2 geometry are the papers [8], [15], [17] and the monograph [2].

Arnold, in his pioneering paper [1], reinterpreted the hydrodynamics of an ideal fluid filling M in terms of the Riemannian geometry of the volumorphism group of M equipped with the L^2 metric describing the fluid's kinetic energy. He showed that a curve $\eta(t)$ is a geodesic of the L^2 metric on $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ starting from the identity element e in the direction v_0 if and only if the time dependent vector field $v = \dot\eta \circ \eta^{-1}$ on M solves the incompressible Euler equations

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_t v + \nabla_v v = -\operatorname{grad} p \\ &\operatorname{div} v = 0 \\ &\langle v, \nu\rangle = 0 \text{ on } \partial M \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

with the initial condition

$$v(0) = v_0 \tag{1.3}$$

where p is the pressure function, ∇ denotes the covariant derivative on M and ν is the outward pointing normal to the boundary ∂M.

It turns out that there is a technical advantage in rewriting the Euler equations this way; Ebin and Marsden [8] showed that the Cauchy problem for the corresponding geodesic equation in $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ can be solved uniquely on short time intervals by a standard Banach-Picard iteration argument. In particular, its solutions depend smoothly on the data, and as a result one can define (at least for small t) a smooth exponential map

$$\exp_e : T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu \to \mathscr{D}^s_\mu, \qquad \exp_e tv_0 = \eta(t),$$

where $\eta(t)$ is the unique geodesic of (1.1) issuing from the identity with initial velocity $v_0 \in T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$. The exponential map is a local diffeomorphism from an open set around zero in $T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ onto a neighborhood of the identity in $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$. This follows from the inverse function theorem and the fact that the derivative of $\exp_e$ at time $t = 0$ is the identity map. Furthermore, if $n = 2$ then by the classical result of Wolibner [24] the exponential map can be extended to the whole tangent space $T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$, which is interpreted as geodesic completeness of the volumorphism group with respect to the L^2 metric. These results continue to hold in the case when the underlying Riemannian manifold M is noncompact with bounded geometry and compact boundary, provided that we restrict to diffeomorphisms that differ from the identity only on a compact subset of M or, more generally, to those that fall off rapidly to the identity at each end of M, cf. e.g., [6], [10], or [13].

The structure and distribution of singularities of the exponential map of (1.1) has been of considerable interest ever since the problem of conjugate points in $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ was raised by Arnold in [1]. The first examples of conjugate points were constructed in [15] and [16] in the case when M is a sphere with the round metric or the flat 2-torus. Further examples can be found in [21], [18], [19], [3] and [4]. In [9] it was proved that the L^2 exponential map is a non-linear Fredholm map of index zero whenever M is a compact manifold of dimension 2 without boundary and moreover that the Fredholm property fails for a steady rotation of the solid torus in $\mathbb{R}^3$. More pathological counterexamples were constructed in [18] using curl eigenfields on the sphere $\mathbb{S}^3$ and more recently in [20] in the case of certain axisymmetric flows in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Furthermore, Shnirelman [22] proved that when M is the flat 2-torus the exponential map on $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ is a Fredholm quasiruled map. In [17] the authors showed that the failure of the Fredholm property in the case of three-dimensional manifolds is "borderline," in the sense that the exponential maps of Sobolev H^r metrics are necessarily Fredholm whenever $r > 0$.

An outstanding problem left unresolved in these papers concerns the case when a two-dimensional manifold M has a nonempty boundary ∂M. The methods employed in [9] allowed only for a much weaker result, namely, that the derivative of the exponential map along a geodesic in $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ can be extended to a linear Fredholm operator defined on the L^2 completions of the tangent spaces to the volumorphism group. The question of whether the behavior is genuinely different in case of a boundary has been raised in light of recent work where phenomena have been discovered that seem to rely heavily on the presence of the boundary (such as double-exponential growth of the vorticity field in 2D [12] and numerically-observed blowup in 3D [14]).

The main goal of the present paper is to establish the strong H^s Fredholmness property of the exponential map for incompressible 2D fluids in the presence of boundaries. For notational simplicity and clarity of exposition we will consider the simplest case of periodic flows in the upper half-plane and work in a single chart. The general case of bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^2$ can be treated in the standard way by choosing a suitable open cover of the boundary ∂M together with a subordinate smooth partition of unity and applying the result for the half-plane. Our main result in this paper is thus the following

Theorem 1. *Let $M = S^1 \times [0, \infty)$ be the periodic upper half-plane with boundary $\partial M = S^1$ and assume $s > 2$. The exponential map of the L^2 metric (1.1) on $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu(M)$ is a nonlinear Fredholm map*

of index zero.

In the next section we recall the basic setup from [9] and [17]. The proof of Theorem 1 will be given in Sections 3 and 4. The key element of the proof involves deriving lower bounds for the invertible part of the derivative dexp_e with respect to a suitably chosen Sobolev-type norm defined on the space of stream functions on the manifold. The main idea here is that we have an operator that is invertible because it is positive-definite in low Sobolev norms, but in the standard higher Sobolev norms it is not due to boundary terms; however by weighting the coefficients differently we can make the operator positive-definite in the new inner product up to leading order.

2 The setup: Jacobi fields and the exponential map

We first collect a few well known facts about Fredholm mappings. A bounded linear operator L between Banach spaces is said to be Fredholm if it has finite dimensional kernel and cokernel. It then follows from the open mapping theorem that $\operatorname{ran} L$ is closed. L is said to be semi-Fredholm if it has closed range and either its kernel or cokernel is of finite dimension. The index of L is defined as $\operatorname{ind} L = \dim\ker L - \dim\operatorname{coker} L$. The set of semi-Fredholm operators is an open subset in the space of all bounded linear operators and the index is a continuous function on this set into $\mathbb{Z}\cup\{\pm\infty\}$, cf. Kato [11]. A C^1 map f between Banach manifolds is called Fredholm if its Fréchet derivative $df(p)$ is a Fredholm operator at each point p in the domain of f. If the domain is connected then the index of the derivative is by definition the index of f, cf. Smale [23].

Let γ be a geodesic in a Riemannian Hilbert manifold. A point $q=\gamma(t)$ is said to be conjugate to $p=\gamma(0)$ if the derivative $d\exp_p(t\dot\gamma(0))$ is not an isomorphism considered as a linear operator between the tangent spaces at p and q. It is called monoconjugate if $d\exp_p(t\dot\gamma(0))$ fails to be injective and epiconjugate if $d\exp_p(t\dot\gamma(0))$ fails to be surjective. In general exponential maps of infinite dimensional Riemannian manifolds are not Fredholm. For example, the antipodal points on the unit sphere in a Hilbert space with the induced metric are conjugate along any great circle and the differential of the corresponding exponential map has infinite dimensional kernel. An ellipsoid constructed by Grossman [7] provides another example as it contains a sequence of monoconjugate points along a geodesic arc converging to a limit point at which the derivative of the exponential map is injective but not surjective. Such pathological phenomena are ruled out by the Fredholm property because in this case monoconjugate and epiconjugate points must coincide, have finite multiplicities and cannot cluster along finite geodesic segments.

Let M be a Riemannian manifold of dimension $n=2$ with boundary ∂M and assume $s>2$. Given any vector v_0 in $T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ let $\eta(t)=\exp_e(tv_0)$ be the geodesic of the L^2 metric starting from the identity with velocity v_0. The derivative of the exponential map at tv_0 can be expressed in terms of the Jacobi fields. Since the curvature tensor $\mathcal{R}$ of the L^2 metric is bounded in the H^s topology it follows that the solutions of the Jacobi equation

$$J''+\mathcal{R}(J,\dot\eta)\dot\eta=0 \tag{2.1}$$

along $\eta(t)$ with initial conditions

$$J(0)=0,\quad J'(0)=w_0 \tag{2.2}$$

are unique and persist (as long as the geodesic is defined) by the standard ODE theory on Banach manifolds, cf. [15]. Define the Jacobi field solution operator Φ_t by

$$w_0\to\Phi_t w_0 = d\exp_e(tv_0)tw_0 = J(t). \tag{2.3}$$

Next, recall that for any $\eta \in \mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ the group adjoint operator on $T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ is given by $\mathrm{Ad}_\eta = dR_{\eta^{-1}} dL_\eta$ where R_η and L_η denote the right and left translations by η. Consequently, given any $v, w \in T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ we have

$$w \to \mathrm{Ad}_\eta w = \eta_* w = D\eta \circ \eta^{-1}(w \circ \eta^{-1}) \tag{2.4}$$

and the corresponding algebra adjoint operator

$$\mathrm{ad}_v w = -[v, w]. \tag{2.5}$$

The associated coadjoint operators are defined using the L^2 inner product by

$$\langle \mathrm{Ad}^*_\eta v, w\rangle_{L^2} = \langle v, \mathrm{Ad}_\eta w\rangle_{L^2} \tag{2.6}$$

and

$$\langle \mathrm{ad}^*_v u, w\rangle_{L^2} = \langle u, \mathrm{ad}_v w\rangle_{L^2} \tag{2.7}$$

for any u, v and $w \in T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$. Our general strategy of the proof of Theorem 1 will be similar to that in the case when M has no boundary. The proofs of the following result can be found in [17].

Proposition 2. *Let $v_0 \in T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ and let $\eta(t)$ be the geodesic of the L^2 metric (1.1) in $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ starting from the identity e with velocity v_0. Then Φ_t defined in (2.3) is a family of bounded linear operators from $T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ to $T_{\eta(t)}\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$. Furthermore, if $v_0 \in T_e\mathscr{D}^{s+1}_\mu$ then Φ_t can be represented as*

$$\Phi_t = D\eta(t)\big(\Omega_t - \Gamma_t\big) \tag{2.8}$$

where Ω_t and Γ_t are bounded operators on $T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ given by

$$\Omega_t = \int_0^t \mathrm{Ad}_{\eta(\tau)^{-1}} \mathrm{Ad}^*_{\eta(\tau)^{-1}}\, d\tau \tag{2.9}$$

$$\Gamma_t = \int_0^t \mathrm{Ad}_{\eta(\tau)^{-1}} K_{v(\tau)} dR_{\eta^{-1}(\tau)} \Phi_\tau\, d\tau \tag{2.10}$$

and K_v is a compact operator on $T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ given by

$$w \to K_{v(t)} w = \mathrm{ad}^*_w v(t), \quad w \in T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu \tag{2.11}$$

and where $v(t)$ is the solution of the Cauchy problem (1.2)-(1.3).

Proof. See [9], Prop. 4 and Prop. 8. □

Remark 3. Note that the decomposition (2.8)-(2.11) must be applied with care. This is due to the loss of derivatives involved in calculating the differential of the left translation operator $\xi \to L_\eta \xi$ and consequently of the adjoint operator in (2.4). This is why we consider v_0, and hence $\eta(t)$, in H^{s+1} rather than H^s.

As mentioned in the Introduction we also have the following

Proposition 4. *For any $v_0 \in T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ the derivative $d\exp_e(tv_0)$ extends to a Fredholm operator on the L^2-completions $\overline{T_e\mathscr{D}_\mu}^{L^2}$ and $\overline{T_{\exp_e(tv_0)}\mathscr{D}_\mu}^{L^2}$.*

Proof. A detailed proof may be found in [9], Thm. 2, but the main idea is as follows. The operator (2.9) is invertible on $\overline{T_e\mathscr{D}_\mu}^{L^2}$. This follows from Lemma 5 below and self-adjointness in the L^2 inner product. Compactness of the operator (2.10) on $\overline{T_e\mathscr{D}_\mu}^{L^2}$ follows from compactness of the operator K_v, and hence compactness of the composition appearing under the integral in (2.10), and finally from viewing the integral as a limit of sums of compact operators. This represents $d\exp_e(tv_0)$ as the sum of an invertible operator and compact operator which implies $d\exp_e(tv_0)$ is Fredholm of index zero. □

In particular, it follows that monoconjugate points along $\eta(t)$ in $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ have finite multiplicity.

3 Proof of Theorem 1: Preliminary Estimates

To show that the L^2 exponential map on $\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ is a Fredholm map we will prove that for each $t>0$ its derivative Φ_t is a bounded Fredholm operator from $T_e\mathscr{D}^s_e$ to $T_{\eta(t)}\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$; that is, Φ_t can be expressed as the sum of an invertible operator and a compact operator on $T_e\mathcal{D}^s_\mu$. We will assume that the initial divergence free vector field v_0 in (2.3) is of class C^∞. The general H^s case will then follow from a density argument, just as in [9]. Compactness of (2.10) then follows from Proposition 2 as described in the proof of Proposition 4.

It remains to prove that the operator Ω_t, defined by (2.9), is invertible on the tangent space $T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$. We begin with an L^2 estimate which is straightforward.

Lemma 5. *Assume $s>2$. Given $v_0\in T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ let $\eta(t)=\exp_e tv_0$ be the corresponding L^2 geodesic. For any $w\in T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu$ and any $t\geq 0$ we have*

$$\langle w,\Omega_t w\rangle_{L^2}\geq C_t\|w\|^2_{L^2} \tag{3.1}$$

where $C_t=\int_0^t\|D\eta(\tau)\|_\infty^{-2}d\tau$.

Proof. From (2.9) we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\langle w,\Omega_t w\rangle_{L^2}&=\int_0^t\big\langle w,\mathrm{Ad}_{\eta(\tau)^{-1}}\mathrm{Ad}^*_{\eta(\tau)^{-1}}w\big\rangle_{L^2}d\tau\\&=\int_0^t\big\|\mathrm{Ad}^*_{\eta(\tau)^{-1}}w\big\|^2_{L^2}d\tau\geq\|w\|^2_{L^2}\int_0^t\big\|\mathrm{Ad}^*_{\eta(\tau)}\|^{-2}_{L(L^2)}d\tau\end{aligned}$$

and since Ad^*_η is an L^2 adjoint of Ad_η, formula (2.4) implies

$$\|\mathrm{Ad}^*_{\eta(t)}\|^2_{L(L^2)}=\|\mathrm{Ad}_{\eta(t)}\|^2_{L(L^2)}\lesssim\|D\eta(t)^{\mathrm{T}}D\eta(t)\|_\infty$$

which gives (3.1). □

Next, we proceed to derive the estimate in H^s norms. It will be convenient to work with stream functions on $M=S^1\times[0,\infty)$. More precisely, we introduce the space

$$\mathcal{F}^{s+1}(M)=\big\{f\in H^{s+1}(M):f\text{ vanishes rapidly as }y\to\infty\text{ and }f|_{\partial M}=0\big\}$$

so that

$$T_e\mathscr{D}^s_\mu(M)=\big\{v_f=-\partial_y f\tfrac{\partial}{\partial x}+\partial_x f\tfrac{\partial}{\partial y}:f\in\mathcal{F}^{s+1}(M)\big\}.$$

From (2.4) and (2.6) we have

$$\mathrm{Ad}_{\eta^{-1}(t)}\mathrm{Ad}^*_{\eta^{-1}(t)}v_f=v_{\Lambda_t^{-1}f}\quad\text{where}\quad\Lambda_t=\Delta_0^{-1}\circ R_{\eta(t)}\circ\Delta\circ R_{\eta^{-1}(t)}. \tag{3.2}$$

Here $f=\Delta_0^{-1}g$ is the unique solution of the Dirichlet problem $\Delta f=g$ with $f|_{\partial M}=0$ and $R_\eta g=g\circ\eta$. Our goal therefore reduces to establishing the following

$$\text{Claim: }\textit{For any }t>0\textit{ the operator }f\to\widehat{\Omega}_t f=\int_0^t\Lambda_\tau^{-1}f\,d\tau\textit{ is invertible on }\mathcal{F}^{s+1}(M). \tag{3.3}$$

To this end we will proceed indirectly since the formula for Λ_t is somewhat simpler to work with than the formula for the inverse $\Lambda_t^{-1}=R_{\eta(t)}\circ\Delta_0^{-1}\circ R_{\eta^{-1}(t)}\circ\Delta$. Our approach to proving the claim (3.3) is as follows. For some constants $B_0,...,B_s$ we define a semi-inner product on $\mathcal{F}^{s+1}$ by

$$\langle\!\langle f,g\rangle\!\rangle_{s+1}=\sum_{j=0}^s B_j\langle\partial_x^j\partial_y^{s-j}\nabla f,\partial_x^j\partial_y^{s-j}\nabla g\rangle_{L^2} \tag{3.4}$$

with associated semi-norm $\|f\|_{s+1} = \langle\!\langle f, f\rangle\!\rangle_{s+1}^{1/2}$. Then, we show that the constants $B_0, ..., B_s$ can be chosen to be positive so that this semi-norm defines a norm, equivalent to the Sobolev H^{s+1} norm, with

$$\langle\!\langle f, g\rangle\!\rangle_{s+1} \geq K\|f\|_{s+1}^2 - C\|f\|_{s+1}\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s} \tag{3.5}$$

for $g = \Lambda_t f$, where $\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s}$ denotes the homogeneous Sobolev norm defined by (3.8) below. Applying this estimate to $f = \Lambda_t^{-1} g$ shows that $\widehat{\Omega}_t$ has closed range on $\mathcal{F}^{s+1}$. This, together with Lemma 1, implies that $\widehat{\Omega}_t$ is semi-Fredholm with trivial kernel whose index at $t = 0$ is zero. Since the index is constant on connected component of the space of semi-Fredholm operators (cf. [11]) we conclude that the index is always zero so that $\widehat{\Omega}_t$ has trivial cokernel and is therefore invertible. To carry out this plan we need to estimate the boundary terms and this is our main goal here; the analysis of these terms begins in Proposition 3 below. The following observation will be convenient in the calculations.

Lemma 6. *Let $f\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$ be any H^{s+1} function vanishing at infinity and let $\eta \in \mathscr{D}_\mu(M)$ be a smooth area-preserving diffeomorphism. Then*

$$\Delta(f \circ \eta^{-1}) \circ \eta = \operatorname{div}(G_\eta \nabla f) \qquad \text{where} \quad G_\eta = (D\eta^T D\eta)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} |\partial_y \eta|^2 & -\langle \partial_x \eta, \partial_y \eta\rangle \\ -\langle \partial_x \eta, \partial_y \eta\rangle & |\partial_x \eta|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. Let $g\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$ be any smooth function that vanishes on ∂M. Then by the change of variables formula and an integration by parts we have

$$\int_M g\Delta(f \circ \eta^{-1}) \circ \eta \, dxdy = \int_M g \circ \eta^{-1} \, \Delta(f \circ \eta^{-1}) \, dxdy = -\int_M \langle \nabla(g \circ \eta^{-1}), \nabla(f \circ \eta^{-1})\rangle \, dxdy.$$

Observe that $\nabla(f \circ \eta^{-1}) = (D\eta^{-1})^{\mathrm{T}} \nabla f \circ \eta^{-1}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M g\Delta(f \circ \eta^{-1}) \circ \eta \, dxdy &= -\int_M \langle (D\eta^{-1})^{\mathrm{T}} \nabla f \circ \eta^{-1}, (D\eta^{-1})^{\mathrm{T}} \nabla g \circ \eta^{-1}\rangle \, dxdy \\ &= -\int_M \langle (D\eta^{\mathrm{T}})^{-1} \nabla f, (D\eta^{\mathrm{T}})^{-1} \nabla g\rangle \, dxdy, \end{aligned}$$

using the change of variables formula once more. We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_M g\Delta(f \circ \eta^{-1}) \circ \eta \, dxdy &= -\int_M \langle (D\eta^{\mathrm{T}} D\eta)^{-1} \nabla f, \nabla g\rangle \, dxdy \\ &= \int_M g \operatorname{div}\left((D\eta^{\mathrm{T}} D\eta)^{-1} \nabla f\right) dxdy, \end{aligned}$$

and since this is true for every smooth g we deduce (3.6). □

The following inequality appears in [9] but without the boundary terms.

Proposition 7. *Let $\eta \in \mathscr{D}_\mu(M)$ be a C^∞-smooth area-preserving diffeomorphism and let $g = \Lambda f$ where $f \in \mathcal{F}^{s+1}(M)$. For any nonnegative integers m and n let $f_{m,n} = \partial_x^m \partial_y^n f$ and $g_{m,n} = \partial_x^m \partial_y^n g$. Then we have*[1]

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla f_{m,n}, \nabla g_{m,n}\rangle_{L^2} \geq K_\eta \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}^2 - C\|\eta\|_{C^{m+n+1}}^2 \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+n}} \\ - \int_{\partial M} f_{m+1,n} \partial_x^m \partial_y^{n-1} \Big(\partial_x g - |\partial_y \eta|^2 \partial_x f + \langle \partial_x \eta, \partial_y \eta\rangle \partial_y f \Big) \, dx \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

[1]Here we agree to the convention that the boundary integral is zero if $n = 0$.

where $K_\eta = \|D\eta\|_\infty^{-2}$, with C some constant independent of η, and

$$\|f\|_{\dot{H}^{s+1}} = \sum_{0\le i+j\le s} \big\|\nabla \partial_x^i \partial_y^j f\big\|_{L^2}. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. We start with an integration by parts to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla f_{m,n}, \nabla g_{m,n}\rangle_{L^2} &= \int_M \langle \nabla f_{m,n}, \nabla g_{m,n}\rangle \, dxdy \\ &= \int_M \operatorname{div}(f_{m,n}\nabla g_{m,n})\, dxdy - \int_M f_{m,n}\partial_x^m \partial_y^n \Delta g \, dxdy. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Using Lemma 6 we further rewrite the above as

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\int_{\partial M} f_{m,n} g_{m,n+1}\, dx - \int_M f_{m,n} \operatorname{div}(\partial_x^m \partial_y^n G_\eta \nabla f)\, dxdy \\ &= \int_{\partial M} f_{m,n}|_{\partial M}\big(- g_{m,n+1} - \partial_x^m \partial_y^n \langle G_\eta \nabla f, \nu\rangle\big)|_{\partial M}\, dx + \int_M \langle \nabla f_{m,n}, \partial_x^m \partial_y^n G_\eta \nabla f\rangle \, dxdy, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where we again used the divergence theorem and where the outward unit normal is $\nu = (0,-1)$.

We proceed to analyze these terms separately. Observe that $G_\eta = (D\eta^{\mathrm{T}} D\eta)^{-1}$ is a positive-definite matrix and the last term can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla f_{m,n}, \partial_x^m \partial_y^n G_\eta \nabla f\rangle &= \int_M \langle \nabla f_{m,n}, G_\eta \partial_x^m \partial_y^n \nabla f\rangle \, dxdy + \int_M \langle \nabla f_{m,n}, [\partial_x^m \partial_y^n, G_\eta]\nabla f \, dxdy \\ &\ge \int_M |(D\eta^{\mathrm{T}})^{-1}\nabla f_{m,n}|^2 \, dxdy - \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\big\|[\partial_x^m \partial_y^n, G_\eta]\nabla f\big\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since G_η is a matrix of smooth functions, the commutator with any differential operator of order $m+n$ is a differential operator of lower order with coefficients involving derivatives of η up to order $m+n+1$ at most. Hence we have an estimate

$$\big\|[\partial_x^m \partial_y^n, G_\eta]\nabla f\big\|_{L^2} \le C\|\eta\|^2_{C^{m+n+1}} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+n}(M)}$$

with $\|\cdot\|_{\dot{H}^{m+n}}$ denoting the Sobolev H^{m+n} norm that omits the lowest-order terms (in other words, the H^{m+n-1} norm of the gradient). On the other hand we have

$$\int_M |(D\eta^{\mathrm{T}})^{-1}\nabla f_{m,n}|^2 \, dxdy \ge K_\eta \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}^2$$

where K_η is the infimum over M of the eigenvalues of $G_\eta = (D\eta^{\mathrm{T}} D\eta)^{-1}$ and minimizing over all of M gives the formula for K_η.

Next, consider the boundary term in (3.10) given by

$$\int_{\partial M} f_{m,n}\, \partial_x^m \partial_y^n \big(- \partial_y g + |\partial_x \eta|^2 \partial_y f - \langle \partial_x \eta, \partial_y \eta\rangle \partial_x f\big)\, dx.$$

Since $f|_{\partial M} = 0$, we know that $f_{m,0}|_{\partial M} = 0$ so that this term vanishes if $n = 0$. If $n \ge 1$ then we can use the equation $\Delta g = \operatorname{div}(G_\eta \nabla f)$ to simplify

$$\partial_y(-\partial_y g + |\partial_x\eta|^2 \partial_y f - \langle \partial_x\eta, \partial_y\eta\rangle \partial_x f) = \partial_x(\partial_x g - |\partial_y \eta|^2 \partial_x f + \langle \partial_x \eta, \partial_y \eta\rangle \partial_y f) \tag{3.11}$$

so that the boundary term becomes the last term of (3.7) after an integration by parts in x. ∎

Before we proceed further with the proof in full generality, let us illustrate the basic idea with a simple explicit example.

Example 8. Consider the diffeomorphism

$$\eta(x,y) = (x + \phi(y), y),$$

for some function ϕ which decays as $y \to \infty$. This is a shear flow, and the function $\eta(t,x,y) = (x + t\phi(y), y)$ is a solution of the inviscid Euler equation with steady velocity field $u(x,y) = \phi(y)e_x$. The matrix G_η is given by

$$G_\eta = (D\eta^{\mathrm{T}} D\eta)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1+\phi'(y)^2 & -\phi'(y) \\ -\phi'(y) & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Consider the H^2 norm on vector fields, corresponding to the $\dot{H}^3$ norm on stream functions. (This is the first interesting case, as H^1 on vector fields has an accidental cancellation[2] and L^2 on vector fields is the weak case already discussed.) We now consider the three terms that together make up the $\dot{H}^3$ inner product, and weight them with positive constants B_i: we get

$$\langle\!\langle f, g \rangle\!\rangle_3 = B_0 \langle \nabla f_{yy}, \nabla g_{yy} \rangle_{L^2} + B_1 \langle \nabla f_{xy}, \nabla g_{xy} \rangle_{L^2} + B_2 \langle \nabla f_{xx}, \nabla g_{xx} \rangle_{L^2}. \tag{3.12}$$

By Proposition 7, the leading-order terms in (3.12) are

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\!\langle f, g \rangle\!\rangle_3 &= B_0 \|G_\eta \nabla f_{yy}\|_{L^2}^2 + B_1 \|G_\eta \nabla f_{xy}\|_{L^2}^2 + B_2 \|G_\eta \nabla f_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\qquad - \int_{S^1} B_0 f_{xyy}(x,0) \big(g_{xy}(x,0) - (1+\phi'(0)^2) f_{xy}(x,0) + \phi'(0) f_{yy}(x,0) \big) \\
&\qquad - \int_{S^1} B_1 f_{xxy}(x,0) \big(g_{xx}(x,0) - (1+\phi'(0)^2) f_{xx}(x,0) + \phi'(0) f_{xy}(x,0) \big) \\
&= B_0 \|G_\eta \nabla f_{yy}\|_{L^2}^2 + B_1 \|G_\eta \nabla f_{xy}\|_{L^2}^2 + B_2 \|G_\eta \nabla f_{xx}\|_{L^2}^2 \\
&\qquad - B_0 \int_{S^1} f_{xyy}(x,0) g_{xy}(x,0)\, dx + B_0 (1+\phi'(0)^2) \int_{S^1} f_{xyy}(x,0) f_{xy}(x,0)\, dx,
\end{aligned}$$

after integrating by parts.
Now we can estimate the second boundary term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{S^1} f_{xyy}(x,0) f_{xy}(x,0)\, dx &= -\int_M \partial_y (f_{xyy} f_{xy})\, dA = -\int_M (f_{xyyy} f_{xy} + f_{xyy}^2)\, dA \\
&= \int_M (f_{yyy} f_{xxy} - f_{xyy}^2)\, dA \\
&\geq -\frac{\varepsilon}{2} \int_M f_{yyy}^2\, dA - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_M f_{xxy}^2\, dA - \int_M f_{xyy}^2\, dA.
\end{aligned}$$

Likewise we can estimate the first boundary term and combine with an upper bound on g given by $\|\nabla g_{xy}\| \leq C_\eta \|\nabla f_{xy}\|$ to get similar terms, ignoring lower-order terms. We end up with

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\!\langle f, g \rangle\!\rangle_3 \geq{}& B_0 \big(K_\eta - \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2} \tilde{C}_\eta \big) \|f_{yyy}\|^2 + \big(K_\eta (B_0 + B_1) - \tilde{C}_\eta B_0 \big) \|f_{xyy}\|^2 \\
&+ \big(K_\eta (B_1 + B_2) - \tfrac{1}{2\varepsilon} \tilde{C}_\eta B_0 \big) \|f_{xxy}\|^2 + K_\eta B_2 \|f_{xxx}\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{C}_\eta = 1 + \phi'(0)^2 + C_\eta$, ignoring all lower-order terms.

[2] See Lemma 11.

From this formula we see that if ε is sufficiently small and $B_2 \gg B_1 \gg B_0 > 0$, then we can arrange

$$\langle\!\langle f, g \rangle\!\rangle_3 \geq c_\eta \|f\|_3^2$$

for some very small $c_\eta > 0$, up to lower-order terms. This implies that the map $f \mapsto g = \Lambda f$ has closed range, which leads to invertibility. This is the main idea of the proof we give in the next section.

4 Proof of Theorem 1: Estimates at the Boundary

We now need to estimate the boundary terms appearing in equation (3.7). The following lemma simplifies many of the calculations.

Lemma 9. *For any H^1 functions f and g on M vanishing at infinity, we have*

$$\int_{\partial M} f \partial_x g \, dx \leq \|\nabla f\|_{L^2} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. A straightforward computation gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial M} f(x,0) \partial_x g(x,0) \, dx &= -\int_{\partial M} \int_0^\infty \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \Big(f(x,y) \partial_x g(x,y) \Big) \, dy dx \\
&= -\int_M \partial_y f \partial_x g \, dx dy + \int_M \partial_x f \partial_y g \, dx dy \\
&= \Big\langle (-\partial_y f, \partial_x f), (\partial_x g, \partial_y g) \Big\rangle_{L^2} \leq \|\nabla f\|_{L^2} \|\nabla g\|_{L^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we estimate the boundary terms in Proposition 7 in terms of norms on the entire space M.

Proposition 10. *Let $\eta \in \mathscr{D}_\mu(M)$. If $f \in \mathcal{F}^{s+1}(M)$ and $g = \Lambda f$ then given any $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$ the boundary terms in* (3.7) *can be estimated by*

$$\int_{\partial M} f_{m+1,n} g_{m+1,n-1} \, dx \leq \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla g_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2} \qquad (n > 1) \tag{4.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial M} f_{m+1,n} \partial_x^m \partial_y^{n-1} \big(|\partial_y \eta|^2 \partial_x f \big) \, dx &\leq \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2 \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla f_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2} \\
&\quad + C \|\eta\|_{C^{m+n+1}}^2 \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+n}}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

$$\int_{\partial M} f_{m+1,n} \partial_x^m \partial_y^{n-1} \big(\langle \partial_x \eta, \partial_y \eta \rangle \partial_y f \big) \, dx \leq C \|\eta\|_{C^{m+n+1}}^2 \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+n}} \tag{4.3}$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of η and the $\dot{H}^{m+n}$ norm is defined in (3.8).

Proof. Inequality (4.1) follows at once from Lemma 9. To estimate (4.2) we use Lemma 9 and the Leibniz rule to get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial M} f_{m+1,n} \partial_x^m \partial_y^{n-1} \big(|\partial_y \eta|^2 \partial_x f \big) \, dx &\leq \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla \partial_x^m \partial_y^{n-1} \big(|\partial_y \eta|^2 \partial_x f \big)\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2 \|\nabla f_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2} \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} + C \|\eta\|_{C^{m+n+1}}^2 \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+n}} \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}
\end{aligned}$$

For (4.3) we use a trick on the highest-order term to improve over Lemma 9:

$$\int_{\partial M} f_{m+1,n}\partial_x^m\partial_y^{n-1}\big(\langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle\partial_y f\big)\,dx \le \int_{\partial M} f_{m+1,n}\langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle f_{m,n}\,dx \\ + C\|\eta\|^2_{C^{m+n+1}}\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}}\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}$$

Now integrating the first term on the right by parts, we obtain (using Lemma 9)

$$\int_{\partial M} f_{m+1,n}\langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle f_{m,n}\,dx = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial M}\langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle\,\partial_x(f_{m,n}^2)\,dx = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\partial M}\partial_x\langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle f_{m,n}^2\,dx \\ \lesssim \|\eta\|_{C^2}\|f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\eta\|_{C^2}\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}}\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2},$$

and thus this term folds into our previous term. □

It remains to estimate the term $\|\nabla g_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2}$ in terms of a suitable norm of f.

Lemma 11. *Let η, f and $g=\Lambda f$ be as in Proposition 10. For any integers $m\ge 1$ and $n>1$ we have*

$$\|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \le \|\nabla g_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2} + \|\eta\|^2_{C^1}\|\nabla f_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2} + \|\eta\|^2_{C^1}\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \\ + C\|\eta\|^2_{C^{m+n+1}}\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}} \tag{4.4}$$

while for $n=0$ or $n=1$ we have

$$\|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \le \|\eta\|^2_{C^1}\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} + C\|\eta\|^2_{C^{m+n+1}}\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}} \tag{4.5}$$

where C is a constant depending on m and n but not on η.

Proof. Integrating by parts as in (3.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla g_{m,n}\|^2_{L^2} &= \int_M \operatorname{div}(g_{m,n}\nabla g_{m,n})\,dxdy - \int_M g_{m,n}\Delta g_{m,n}\,dxdy \\ &= \int_{\partial M} g_{m,n}\partial_x^m\partial_y^n(-\partial_y g - \langle G_\eta\nabla f,\nu\rangle)\,dx + \langle\nabla g_{m,n},\partial_x^m\partial_y^n G_\eta\nabla f\rangle_{L^2}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

We first consider the case when $m\ge 1$ and $n>1$. Since $\langle G_\eta\nabla f,\nu\rangle = \langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle\partial_x f - |\partial_x\eta|^2\partial_y f$ from (3.11) we get

$$\partial_y(-\partial_y g - \langle G_\eta\nabla f,\nu\rangle) = \partial_x(\partial_x g - |\partial_y\eta|^2\partial_x f + \langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle\partial_y f)$$

Using this identity and integrating by parts in x the right hand side of (4.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}&= -\int_{\partial M} g_{m+1,n}\partial_x^m\partial_y^{n-1}(\partial_x g - |\partial_y\eta|^2\partial_x f + \langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle\partial_y f)\,dx + \langle\nabla g_{m,n},\partial_x^m\partial_y^n G_\eta\nabla f\rangle_{L^2} \\ &= -\int_{\partial M} g_{m+1,n}g_{m+1,n-1}dx + \int_{\partial M}|\partial_y\eta|^2 g_{m+1,n}f_{m+1,n-1}dx - \int_{\partial M}\langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle g_{m+1,n}f_{m,n}dx \\ &\qquad + \sum_{0<k+l<m+n}\int_{\partial M}\alpha_{kl}g_{m+1,n}f_{k,l}dx + \langle\nabla g_{m,n},\partial_x^m\partial_y^n G_\eta\nabla f\rangle_{L^2} \\ &= I + II + III + IV + V\end{aligned}$$

where α_{ij} are functions depending on the derivatives up to order $m+n-1$ of $|\partial_y\eta|^2$ and $\langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle$ and the binomial coefficients. Using Lemma 9 and (3.8) we have

$$\begin{aligned}|I+II+III| &\le \|\nabla g_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla(|\partial_y\eta|^2 f_{m+1,n-1})\|_{L^2} \\ &\qquad + \|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla(\langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle f_{m,n})\|_{L^2} \\ &\le \big(\|\nabla g_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2} + \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2\|\nabla f_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2} + \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \\ &\qquad + \|\eta\|_{C^2}^2\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}}\big)\|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

and similarly

$$|IV| \lesssim \sum_{0<k+l<m+n} \|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla(\alpha_{kl}f_{k,l})\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|\eta\|_{C^{m+n+1}}^2\|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}}. \tag{4.8}$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the Leibniz rule

$$\begin{aligned}|V| &\le \|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\|\partial_x^m\partial_y^n G_\eta\nabla f\|_{L^2} \\ &\le \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2\|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\|\eta\|_{C^{m+n+1}}^2\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Combining (4.7), (4.8) and (4.9) we obtain (4.4), as desired.

Next, if $m\ge 1$ and $n=0$ then the boundary term in (4.6) vanishes since $g|_{\partial M}=0$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla g_{m,0}\|_{L^2}^2 &\le \|\nabla g_{m,0}\|_{L^2}\|\partial_x^m G_\eta\nabla f\|_{L^2} \\ &\le \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2\|\nabla g_{m,0}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla f_{m,0}\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla g_{m,0}\|_{L^2}\|\eta\|_{C^{m+1}}^2\|f\|_{\dot H^m}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Finally, if $m\ge 1$ and $n=1$ we use a trick to do a little better than (4.4). Integrating by parts in (4.6) as before we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla g_{m,1}\|_{L^2}^2 = &-\int_{\partial M} g_{m+1,1}\partial_x^{m+1}g\,dx + \int_{\partial M} g_{m+1,1}\partial_x^m(|\partial_y\eta|^2\partial_x f)\,dx \\ &- \int_{\partial M} g_{m+1,1}\partial_x^m(\langle\partial_x\eta,\partial_y\eta\rangle\partial_y f)\,dx + \langle\nabla g_{m,1},\partial_x^m\partial_y(G_\eta\nabla f)\rangle_{L^2}\end{aligned}$$

The first two terms on the right hand side drop out since $g|_{\partial M}=f|_{\partial M}=0$. The remaining terms can be estimated using Lemma 9 and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality as before to get

$$\|\nabla g_{m,1}\|_{L^2}^2 \le \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2\|\nabla g_{m,1}\|_{L^2}\|\nabla f_{m,1}\|_{L^2} + C\|\nabla g_{m,1}\|_{L^2}\|\eta\|_{C^{m+2}}\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+1}} \tag{4.11}$$

where we used the homogeneous norm (9). □

Our next task is to eliminate all g-terms on the right side of the basic inequality (4.4).

Proposition 12. *Let η, f and $g=\Lambda f$ be as above. For any $m\ge 1$ and $n\ge 0$ we have*

$$\|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \le \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} + 2\|\eta\|_{C^1}^2\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\|\nabla f_{m+n-k,k}\|_{L^2} + C\|\eta\|_{C^{m+n+1}}^2\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}} \tag{4.12}$$

for some constant C independent of η.

Proof. Adding and subtracting terms and using inequalities (4.4) and (4.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla g_{m,n}\|_{L^2} &= \|\nabla g_{m+n-1,1}\|_{L^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\Big(\|\nabla g_{m+n-k-1,k+1}\|_{L^2} - \|\nabla g_{m+n-k,k}\|_{L^2}\Big)\\ &\le \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2\|\nabla f_{m+n-1,1}\|_{L^2} + \|\eta\|_{C^1}^2\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\Big(\|\nabla f_{m+n-k-1,k+1}\|_{L^2} + \|\nabla f_{m+n-k,k}\|_{L^2}\Big)\\ &\quad + C\|\eta\|_{C^{m+n+1}}^2\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}},\end{aligned}$$

and (4.12) follows. □

Given an integer $s \ge 0$ and any numbers $B_0, \dots B_s$ define a semi-inner product on the space of stream functions on M by

$$\langle\!\langle f, g\rangle\!\rangle_{s+1} = \sum_{j=0}^{s} B_j \langle \partial_x^j \partial_y^{s-j}\nabla f, \partial_x^j\partial_y^{s-j}\nabla g\rangle_{L^2} \tag{4.13}$$

and the associated seminorm by $\|f\|_{s+1} = \langle\!\langle f, f\rangle\!\rangle_{s+1}^{1/2}$.

Proposition 13. *Let $\eta(t)$ be a smooth curve in $\mathscr{D}_\mu(M)$. Let f be a smooth function with $f|_{\partial M} = 0$ and let $g(t) = \Lambda_t f$. Given $s \ge 1$ there exist positive coefficients $B_0, \dots B_s$ depending on η but independent of t such that for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\langle\!\langle f, g\rangle\!\rangle_{s+1} \ge K\|f\|_{s+1}^2 - C\|f\|_{s+1}\|f\|_{\dot H^s} \tag{4.14}$$

where $K > 0$ and $C > 0$ are constants depending on ϵ and s; in addition K depends on the $L^\infty C^1_x$-norm and C depends on the $L^\infty_t C^{s+1}_x$-norm[3] of η.

Proof. From Proposition 7 for any $t \ge 0$ and any integers $m \ge 0$ and $n \ge 0$ with $m+n = s$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\!\langle \nabla f_{mn}, \nabla g_{mn}(t)\rangle\!\rangle_{L^2} &\ge K_\eta\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}^2 - C\|\eta\|_{L^\infty_t C^{m+n+1}}^2\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}}\\ &\quad - \int_{\partial M} f_{m+1,n}\partial_x^m\partial_y^{n-1}\big(\partial_x g - |\partial_y\eta|^2\partial_x f + \langle\partial_x\eta, \partial_y\eta\rangle\partial_y f\big)dx\end{aligned}$$

for some constant C independent of η. Note that by convention[4] the integral over the boundary vanishes if $n = 0$ and, furthermore, the first term of the integral (corresponding to the factor $\partial_x g$) also vanishes if $n = 1$ (since $g|_{\partial M} = 0$ by assumption). Therefore, using Proposition 10, we can now estimate the above expression from below by (using various constants, all of which we denote by C)

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\nabla f_{m,n}, \nabla g_{m,n}\rangle_{L^2} \ge K_\eta\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}^2 &- \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\Big(\|\nabla g_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2} + \|\eta\|_{L^\infty_t C^1_x}^2\|\nabla f_{m+1,n-1}\|_{L^2}\Big)\\ &- C\|\eta\|_{L^\infty_t C^{m+n+1}_x}^2\|f\|_{\dot H^{m+n}}\|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}\end{aligned}$$

[3] That is, $\|\varphi\|_{L^\infty_t C^k_x} = \sup_{0\le\tau\le t}\|\varphi(\tau)\|_{C^k}$.

[4] See the footnote to Proposition 7.

and, with the help of Proposition 12 and rearranging and combining like terms, estimate it even further by

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \nabla f_{m,n}, \nabla g_{m,n}\rangle_{L^2} &\geq K_\eta \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}^2 - 2\|\eta\|_{L_t^\infty C_x^1}^2 \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \|\nabla f_{m+n-k,k}\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad - C\|\eta\|_{L_t^\infty C_x^{m+n+1}}^2 \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+n}} \\ &\geq \Big(K_\eta - (s-1)\epsilon \|\eta\|_{L_t^\infty C_x^1}^2\Big) \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}^2 - \frac{1}{\epsilon}\|\eta\|_{L_t^\infty C_x^1}^2 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \|\nabla f_{m+n-k,k}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad - C\|\eta\|_{L_t^\infty C_x^{m+n+1}}^2 \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+n}}\end{aligned}$$

for any positive ϵ.
Setting

$$C_\eta = C\|\eta\|_{L_t^\infty C_x^{s+1}}^2 \tag{4.15}$$

$$Q_\epsilon = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\|\eta\|_{L_t^\infty C_x^1}^2 \tag{4.16}$$

$$K_\epsilon = \inf_{0\leq\tau\leq t} K_\eta - \frac{(s-1)}{2}\epsilon \|\eta\|_{L_t^\infty C_x^{s+1}}^2 \tag{4.17}$$

and choosing

$$0 < \epsilon < \frac{\inf_{0\leq\tau\leq t} K_\eta}{(s-1)\|\eta\|_{L_t^\infty C_x^1}^2} \tag{4.18}$$

we therefore obtain

$$\langle \nabla f_{m,n}, \nabla g_{m,n}\rangle_{L^2} \geq K_\epsilon \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2}^2 - Q_\epsilon \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \|\nabla f_{m+n-k,k}\|_{L^2}^2 - C_\eta \|\nabla f_{m,n}\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^{m+n}} \tag{4.19}$$

for any integers $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq 0$.

Next, let $s \geq 1$. Given positive numbers $B_0, \ldots, B_s$ (to be determined below) consider

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\!\langle f, g\rangle\!\rangle_{s+1} &= \sum_{j=0}^{s} B_j \langle \partial_x^j \partial_y^{s-j} \nabla f, \partial_x^j \partial_y^{s-j} \nabla g\rangle_{L^2} = \sum_{j=0}^{s} B_j \langle \nabla f_{j,s-j}, \nabla g_{j,s-j}\rangle_{L^2} \\ &\geq \sum_{j=0}^{s} B_j \left(K_\epsilon \|\nabla f_{j,s-j}\|_{L^2}^2 - Q_\epsilon \sum_{k=1}^{s-j-1} \|\nabla f_{s-k,k}\|_{L^2}^2 - C_\eta \|\nabla f_{j,s-j}\|_{L^2} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^s} \right) \\ &= B_0 K_\epsilon \|\nabla f_{0,s}\|_{L^2}^2 + B_s K_\epsilon \|\nabla f_{s,0}\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} \left(K_\epsilon B_k - Q_\epsilon \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} B_j \right) \|\nabla f_{k,s-k}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad - C_{\eta,B}^s \|f\|_{s+1} \|f\|_{\dot{H}^s}\end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\eta,B}^s = C_\eta (s+1)^{1/2} \max_{0\leq j\leq s} \sqrt{B_j}$. Now, for any $1 \leq k \leq s-1$ pick

$$B_k = \frac{2}{K_\epsilon} Q_\epsilon \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} B_j \tag{4.20}$$

and set $B_0 = B_s = 1$. Note that the solution of the recurrence equation in (4.20) is easily found to be $B_k = (1 + 2Q_\epsilon/K_\epsilon)^{k-1} 2Q_\epsilon/K_\epsilon$ where Q_ϵ, K_ϵ and $\epsilon > 0$ are given by (4.16), (4.17) and (4.18). Combining these we now obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\!\langle f, g\rangle\!\rangle_{s+1} &\geq \frac{1}{2}K_\epsilon\Big(\|\nabla f_{0,s}\|_{L^2}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} B_k \|\nabla f_{k,s-k}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|\nabla f_{s,0}\|_{L^2}^2\Big) - C_{\eta,B}^s \|f\|_{s+1}\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}K_\epsilon \|f\|_{s+1}^2 - C_{\eta,B}^s \|f\|_{s+1}\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s}\end{aligned}$$

which is the desired estimate. □

We can now address the Claim 3.3.

Proposition 14. *Let $M = S^1 \times [0, \infty)$ and let $\eta(t)$ be a smooth curve of area-preserving diffeomorphisms $\mathscr{D}_\mu(M)$. Given any $t > 0$ the operator $\widehat{\Omega}_t = \int_0^t \Lambda_\tau^{-1}\, d\tau$ defined in (3.3) on the space $\mathcal{F}^{s+1}(M)$ of stream functions to itself is invertible.*

Proof. For any $0 \leq \tau \leq t$ applying Proposition 13 to $f = \Lambda_t^{-1} g$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\!\langle g, \Lambda_\tau^{-1} g\rangle\!\rangle_{s+1} &\geq K\|\Lambda_\tau^{-1} g\|_{s+1}^2 - C\|\Lambda_\tau^{-1} g\|_{s+1}\|\Lambda_\tau^{-1} g\|_{\dot{H}^s} \\ &\geq K N_1^{-2}\|g\|_{s+1}^2 - C N_2^{-1} N_3^{-1}\|g\|_{s+1}\|g\|_{\dot{H}^s},\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

where

$$N_1 = \sup_{0\leq\tau\leq t}\|\Lambda_t\|_{s+1}, \quad N_2 = \inf_{0\leq\tau\leq t}\|\Lambda_t\|_{s+1} \quad \text{and} \quad N_3 = \inf_{0\leq\tau\leq t}\|\Lambda_t\|_{\dot{H}^s}.$$

Integrating both sides of (4.21) over $[0, t]$ and using Cauchy-Schwarz we get

$$\|\widehat{\Omega}_t g\|_{s+1} \geq K t N_1^{-2}\|g\|_{s+1} - C t N_2^{-1} N_3^{-1}\|g\|_{\dot{H}^s}.$$

It follows that $\widehat{\Omega}_t$ has closed range. By Lemma 1, $\widehat{\Omega}_t$ has trivial null-space and it follows that $\widehat{\Omega}_t$ is semi-Fredholm. Since the index of semi-Fredholm operators is constant under continuous perturbations, and since it is zero at $t = 0$, we conclude that the index is always zero. Therefore, $\widehat{\Omega}_t$ also has trivial cokernel and must be invertible on the space of $\mathcal{F}^{s+1}$. □

It now follows that given any smooth divergence free vector field v_0 on M the corresponding operator Ω_t on $T_e\mathscr{D}_\mu$ is also invertible which, in light of Proposition 2, implies that $\Phi_t = D\eta_t(\Omega_t - \Gamma_t)$ is the sum of an invertible operator and a compact operator. We conclude that Φ_t is a Fredholm operator of index zero. This concludes the proof of Theorem 1 in the smooth case $v_0 \in T_e\mathscr{D}_\mu$. The H^s case follows by a perturbation argument as in [9] or [17] and will be omitted. The only important thing to note is that our leading-term estimates depend only on the C^1 norm $\|\eta\|_{C^1}$, and thus when we approximate an $\eta \in H^s$ by an $\tilde{\eta} \in C^\infty$, the coefficients in the leading term can be made as close as we want to those we found above.

References

[1] Arnold, V.I., *On the differential geometry of infinite-dimensional Lie groups and its application to the hydrodynamics of perfect fluids*, in Vladimir I. Arnold: collected works vol. 2, Springer, New York 2014.

[2] Arnold, V. and Khesin, B., *Topological Methods in Hydrodynamics*, Springer, New York 1998.

[3] Benn, J., *PhD Dissertation*, University of Notre Dame, 2014.

[4] Benn, J., *Conjugate points on the symplectomorphism group*, Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom. **48** (2015), 133-147.

[5] Benn, J., *The coadjoint operator, conjugate points, and the stability of ideal fluids*, Arnold Math. J. **2** (2016), 249-266.

[6] Cantor, M., *Perfect fluid flows over $\mathbb{R}^n$ with asymptotic conditions*, J. Functional Anal. **18** (1975), 73-84.

[7] Grossman, N., *Hilbert manifolds without epiconjugate points*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (1965), 1365-1371.

[8] Ebin, D. and Marsden, J., *Diffeomorphism groups and the motion of an incompressible fluid*, Ann. of Math. **92** (1970), 102-163.

[9] Ebin, D., Misiołek, G. and Preston, S.C., *Singularities of the exponential map on the volume-preserving diffeomorphism group*, GAFA, Geom. funct. anal. **16** (2006), 850-868.

[10] Eichhorn, J. and Schmid, R., *Form preserving diffeomorphism groups on open manifolds*, Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **14** (1996), 147-176.

[11] Kato, T., *Perturbation Theory for Linear Operators*, Springer, New York 1966.

[12] Kiselev, A. and Šverák, V., *Small scale creation for solutions of the incompressible two-dimensional Euler equation*, Ann. Math. **180** (2014), 1205–1220.

[13] Kriegl, A. and Michor, P., *The Convenient Setting of Global Analysis*, American Mathematical Society, Providence 1997.

[14] Luo, G. and Hou, T., *Toward the finite-time blowup of the 3D axisymmetric Euler equations: a numerical investigation*, Multiscale Model. Simul. **12**(4) (2014), 1722–1776.

[15] Misiołek, G., *Stability of ideal fluids and the geometry of the group of diffeomorphisms*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **42** (1993), 215-235.

[16] Misiolek, G., *Conjugate points in $\mathcal{D}_\mu(\mathbb{T}^2)$*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **124** (1996), 977-982.

[17] Misiołek, G. and Preston, S.C., *Fredholm properties of Riemannian exponential maps on diffeomorphism groups*, Invent. math. **179** (2010), 191-227.

[18] Preston, S.C., *On the volumorphism group, the first conjugate point is always the hardest*, Commun. Math. Phys. **267** (2006), 493-513.

[19] Preston, S.C., *The WKB method for conjugate points in the volumorphism group*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **57** (2008), 3303-3327.

[20] Preston, S.C. and Washabaugh, P., *The geometry of axisymmetric ideal fluid flows with swirl*, Arnold Math J. (2016). doi:10.1007/s40598-016-0058-2.

[21] Shnirelman, A., *Generalized fluid flows, their approximations and applications*, GAFA, Geom. funct. anal. **4** (1994), 586-620.

[22] Shnirelman, A., *Microglobal analysis of the Euler equations*, J. Math. Fluid Mech. **7** (2005), S387-S396.

[23] Smale, S., *An infinite dimensional version of Sard's Theorem*, Amer. J. Math. **87** (1965), 861-865.

[24] Wolibner, W., *Un theoréme sur l'existence du mouvement plan d'un fluide parfait, homogéne, incompressible, pendant un temps infiniment long*, Math. Z. **37** (1933), 698-726.